REMARKS

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not responded to Applicant's

traversal of the restriction requirement included with the December 19, 2003 Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-12, 14-16 and 32 should not be restricted, as they

have already been examined (and allowed). In any event, these claims remain pending in this

Application, and therefore the Examiner's indication that they are no longer pending is incorrect.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-40 are all the claims pending in the Application. Claims 1-8, 13, 17-31 and 33-

40 have been rejected. Claims 9-12, 14-16 and 32 are withdrawn from consideration.

Anticipation Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 13, 17-31 and 33-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as

being anticipated by *Tang et al.* (US 6,160,629; hereinafter *"Tang"*). This rejection is

respectfully traversed.

Tang

Tang discloses that, in prior art systems, printing multiple copies of a document required

a print driver to operate in an operating system background many times, thus slowing the

performance of the computer (col. 1, lines 26-44). *Tang* further indicates that "Mopier" printers

have somewhat helped solve this problem, as they allow one copy of a document to be

transmitted to the Mopier, where it can be printed multiple times (col. 1, line 62 - col. 2, line 4).

Tang seeks to further improve this system by adding the ability to store a document at a

printer for future printing. To do so, *Tang* discloses a system which generates one copy of a

document sought to be printed (col. 3, lines 63-64), along with a PJL variable indicating what

"retention feature" should be used with the document. These retention features include: (1)

"proof and hold," where a copy of the document is printed and stored, and additional copies may

be requested at the printer; (2) "simple retention," where a copy of the document is simply stored

on the printer so that it may be accessed at the printer; and (3) "private printing," which holds the

document until a pass-code is entered at the printer.

Importantly, *Tang* does not disclose the processing of any print jobs at the printer, at least

as claimed in the instant Application. Rather, *Tang* simply provides already processed print jobs

at the printer, where they can be accessed and printed again. Thus, *Tang* is no more relevant

than Applicants admitted prior art, which indicates that processing is done at the computer.

Independent Claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 17 and 18

The Examiner takes the position that *Tang* discloses all the features of independent

claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 17 and 18, alleging, *inter alia*, that:

(1) Regarding claims 1, 4[1] and 7, the recitation that the "print information" includes

"storage format data indicating in what format the print job should be archived" is

disclosed in "col. 4, lines 48-50; the print job is stored in either data file 'i.e., PDL

document and job retention or the print instruction' before it is rendered to a

rasterized image data or as a raterized image file" (O.A., pg. 3); and

---

[1] Independent claim 4 now recites that the "print information" includes "storage format data,"

(2) Regarding claims 1, 7, 13, 17 and 18, the recitation of "a PDL processing section

for processing the PDL document" of the print job is disclosed by "personality 36

in Fig. 3."

Regarding (1), Applicants respectfully disagree. First, the portion of *Tang* cited by the

Examiner merely discloses that "the print job may be stored as a data file, before it is rendered to

a rastorized image file or, preferably, as a rastorized image file." Thus, this cited portion merely

discloses <u>alternative embodiments</u> of file storage such that the system would either be initially

designed to store files as a "data file" <u>or</u> a "rastorized image." There is no teaching or suggestion

in *Tang* that <u>both</u> storage types are provided simultaneously in one printer, and thus there is no

need for provision of any particular information to indicate in what format the print job should be

archived.

Regarding (2), Applicants also respectfully disagree. First, the Examiner has alleged that

personality 36 somehow corresponds to both the recited "PDL processing section for processing

the PDL document" and the recited "interpreter for interpreting the PDL document."

Such an interpretation is unreasonable. First, the only function of personality 36

disclosed in *Tang* is to control "how the print job is rendered into a rastorized data stream" (col.

4, lines 21-22). There is simply no teaching or suggestion that personality 36 is at all capable of

any processing of a PDL document. Rather, the only element that *Tang* indicates as having any

capability of processing a print job is computer 10.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 18 are

patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected

dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 19-31 and 33-40 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 19-31 and 33-40 are separately patentable over the applied references.

For example, regarding claims 2 and 5, Applicants respectfully submit that *Tang* fails to teach or suggest that the computer further comprises "a print instruction section for updating the print information of the print job and making print instructions."

Applicants respectfully submit that there is simply no teaching or suggestion that the print job is ever updated by the computer. *Tang* only discloses the creation of a print job, the transmission of the print job to a printer, and the storage of that print job so that it can be printed in the future. There is no teaching or suggestion of any modification of the print job by the computer. In fact, the only further access to the print job after it leaves the computer 10 is provided by *Tang's* requests for additional copies after the print job has been stored, or the release of the print job by using a pass-code. However, these functions are done by a user <u>at the printer</u>, not from a "print instruction section" that is part of the "computer," as recited in claim 2.

Regarding claims 3, 6 and 8, Applicants respectfully submit that *Tang* fails to teach or suggest storing "a pair of PDL document and printer information and a pair of dot image and print information as the print job."

Specifically, as mentioned above, *Tang* only discloses the storage of a "data file" <u>or</u> a "rastorized image file." There is simply no teaching or suggestion that *Tang* is at all capable of storing both a PDL document and a dot image.

Regarding claims 22, 23 and 24, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references, either alone or in any reasonable combination, teach or suggest that "the print information of the print job stored in the archive can be updated by the computer."

Specifically, as discussed above with respect to claim 2, Tang fails to teach or suggest that computer has any capability to update print jobs after their creation.

Withdrawn Independent Claim 12

Although independent claim 12 has been withdrawn from consideration, Applicants believe (see above traversal argument) that it should remain in consideration with respect to this Application. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 12 is patentable over *Tang* because *Tang* fails to teach or suggest *at least* that "the computer further includes a print instruction section for updating the print information of the print job and making print instructions," for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to dependent claim 2.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 12 is patentable over the applied reference. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that withdrawn dependent claims 14-16 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-40 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-40.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/518,099

Attorney Docket # Q58148

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 3, 2004